Remarks

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner:

(1)   indicated that claims 2-5 and 9 have been canceled;

(2)   objected to claim 7 because of informalities and required appropriate correction; and

(3)   rejected claims 1, 6-8 and 10-11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianco et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,737) ("Bianco") and further in view of Park et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0073322) ("Park").

In response to Item 2 above, Applicant has amended·claim 7, as suggested by the Examiner.

In response to Item 3 above, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection. As stated by the Examiner, Bianco does not disclose sending a unique math table and a random number from the central server to the identification box, with the unique math table being stored at both the central server and the identification box; operating on the random number, at the identification box, with the unique math table to create a first cryptogram when a positive (or negative) match occurs between the first and second encrypted biometric parameters; and sending the first cryptogram from the identification box to the central server. Applicant does not believe that the deficiencies of Bianco are met by the combination of Bianco with Park.

More particularly, Park discloses generating a random number, sending the random number to a client, generating a second random number at the client, encrypting the two random numbers into a ciphertext and then sending the resulting ciphertext to the server. At the server, the ciphertext is decrypted so as to retrieve the two random numbers and then the server compares the random number originally sent to the client

PATEL-2

with the decrypted random number received from the client. Park does not disclose comparing, at the central server, the first cryptogram with the second cryptogram, as is required by claims 1 and 7. Instead, Park compares the random number original sent to the client with the decrypted random number received from the client.

Thus, Applicants believe that claims 1 and 7, and claims 6 and 8, which depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, are now in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 10, which depends from claim 1, is believed to be allowable, at least through dependency.

With respect to claim 11, Applicant has canceled claim 11 without prejudice and subject to Applicant's right to prosecute all canceled subject matter in related applications.

Thus, Applicant believes that this patent application is now in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

In the event that any additional fees may be required in this matter, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0221.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M. Slezak, Esq.
Registration No. 55,625
Pandiscio & Pandiscio, P.C.
470 Totten Pond Road
Waltham, MA 02451-1914
Tel. No. (781) 290-0060

MMS/PATEL2.AMD3

PATEL-2